



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,575	02/12/2004	Joseph Stanley Czyszczewski	BLD920030010US1	5992
50441 7590 05/13/2008 DUFT BORNSSEN & FISHMAN, LLP 1526 SPRUCE STREET SUITE 302 BOULDER, CO 80302				
EXAMINER				
PILLAI, NAMITHA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2173				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/13/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/777,575

Applicant(s)

CZYSZCZEWSKI ET AL.

Examiner

NAMITHA PILLAI

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's submission on 12/21/07 including election of claims 1 and 3-17. The requirement for restriction was previously made in response to the amended claims submitted on 7/11/07. All pending claims have been rejected. The objection to the specification has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6, 559, 979 B1 (Ryan) and U. S. Patent No. 6,938,261 B2 (Camara et al.), herein referred to as Camara.

Referring to claim 1, Ryan discloses a standalone multifunction device (column 1, lines 8-13). Ryan discloses a process, which represents the modifiable user interface module, where the multiple functions which are associated with a plurality of business applications requiring different associated interfaces are configured to adapt to the functionality required by the user (column 5, lines 17-28). Ryan discloses an input device incorporating a graphical user interface (column 5, line 65). Ryan discloses a process representing the source interface module configured to receive input data from at least one document data source (column 2, lines 48-51), the input data representing

documents that are to be configured. Ryan discloses a process representing a target interface module configured to output processed document data (column 4, lines 4-8). Ryan does not disclose a scriptable script engine module. Camara discloses a scriptable script engine module configured to control the operation of the standalone multifunction device and interface with a business application interface (column 4, lines 31-50). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Camara to disclose a scripting means for configuring to control the operation of the standalone multifunction device and interface with a business application interface. Camara has disclosed the efficiency of using a scripting means for controlling a device, where such a script is easier to manage and more efficient for implementation for controlling a hardware device (column 7, lines 22-32). The system of Ryan would benefit from using scripting means for controlling the multifunction device for ease of use and efficiency. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to learn from Camara to use a scripting means for configuring to control the operation of the standalone multifunction device and interface with a business application interface.

Referring to claim 3, Ryan and Camara disclose a plurality of application integration modules configured to interface with the script engine module and provide input and output fields to the user interface module (Camara, Figure 3 and column 4, lines 31-34 and Ryan, column 4, lines 1-17).

Referring to claim 4, Ryan and Camara disclose that each of the application integration modules are further configured to interface with a specified business

application (Camara, Figure 3), where the application integration modules are interfaced with the image processing application.

Referring to claim 5, Ryan discloses a user input module configured to allow a user to customize the input device (column 6, lines 12-17).

Referring to claim 6, Ryan discloses a scanning device configured to transmit document data to the source interface (column 2, lines 43-47).

Referring to claim 7, Ryan discloses a printing device configured to receive document data from the target interface (column 3, lines 38-47).

Referring to claim 8, Ryan discloses communications module configured to transmit and receive data over a plurality of data communication channels (column 3, lines 18-27), with data communication channels further including fax functions means and electronic mail transmission means.

Referring to claim 9, Ryan discloses that the communications module is configured to output processed document data as a facsimile (column 4, lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 10, Ryan discloses that the communications module is configured to output processed document data as an e-mail (column 4, lines 12-17).

Referring to claim 11, Ryan discloses that the communications module is configured to output processed document data to an external device (column 4, lines 8-12).

Referring to claim 13, Ryan discloses a system comprising a data communications network and a standalone multifunction device connected to the data

Art Unit: 2100

communications network (column 3, lines 18-19). Ryan discloses a process, which represents the modifiable user interface module, where the multiple functions which are associated with a plurality of business application interfaces requiring different associated interfaces are configured to adapt to the functionality required by the user (column 5, lines 17-28). Ryan discloses an input device incorporating a graphical user interface (column 5, line 65). Ryan discloses a user input module configured to allow a user to customize the input device (column 6, lines 12-17) and provide a user interface for application interfaces (column 4, lines 1-17). Ryan does not disclose a scriptable script engine module on the standalone multifunction device. Camara discloses a scriptable script engine module configured to control the operation of the standalone multifunction device and interface with a business application (column 4, lines 31-50). Camara discloses a plurality of application integration modules configured to interface with the script engine module (Figure 3 and column 4, lines 31-34). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Camara to disclose a scripting means including a plurality of application integration modules interfacing with the script. Camara has disclosed the efficiency of using a scripting means for controlling a device, where such a script is easier to manage and more efficient for implementation for controlling a hardware device (column 7, lines 22-32). The system of Ryan would benefit from using scripting means for controlling the multifunction device for ease of use and efficiency. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to learn from Camara to use a scripting means including a plurality of application integration modules interfacing with the script.

Referring to claim 14, Ryan discloses a facsimile apparatus configured to receive document data from the multifunction device and transmit the document data as a facsimile (column 4, lines 1-5), where the multifunction device send the document data to a facsimile apparatus when transmitted.

Referring to claim 15, Ryan discloses a computer network system comprising a server connected to a network and a standalone multifunction device connected to the network (column 3, lines 18-25). Ryan discloses an interface module within the multifunction device, the interface module responsible for configuring the user interface for carrying out the functions, the interface module configured to communicate with a plurality of multifunction devices over the network (column 5, lines 17-28), the multifunction devices including the facsimile machine and the multiple personal computers. Ryan discloses a facsimile module within the multifunction device (column 4, lines 1-4), the facsimile module configured to send facsimiles and an e-mail module within the multifunction device (column 4, lines 11-17), the e-mail module configured to send e-mails. Ryan does not disclose a scriptable script engine module within the multifunction device. Camara discloses a scriptable script engine module configured to control the operation of the standalone multifunction device and interface with a business application interface (column 4, lines 31-50). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Camara to disclose a scripting means for configuring to control the operation of the standalone multifunction device and interface with a business application interface. Camara has disclosed the efficiency of using a scripting means for controlling a device, where such a script is

easier to manage and more efficient for implementation for controlling a hardware device (column 7, lines 22-32). The system of Ryan would benefit from using scripting means for controlling the multifunction device for ease of use and efficiency. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to learn from Camara to use a scripting means for configuring to control the operation of the standalone multifunction device and interface with a business application interface.

Referring to claim 16, Ryan discloses that the facsimile module comprises a facsimile apparatus configured to communicate with the server over a data communications network (column 3, lines 38-47).

Referring to claim 17, Ryan discloses that the e-mail module comprises an e-mail server configured to communicate with the server over a data communications network (column 4, lines 12-17).

3. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan, Camara and U. S. Publication No. 2001/0042078 A1 (Anwar).

Referring to claim 12, Ryan and Camara do not disclose that the input device is a touch screen apparatus. Anwar discloses a document management system including an input device that is a touch screen apparatus (page 12, column 2, lines 7-10). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Anwar to disclose that the input device is a touch screen apparatus. Ryan has disclosed various types of input devices and has further disclosed that any other types of input devices may be used in Ryan's system (column 6, lines 3-5). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to disclose that the input device is a touch screen apparatus.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 7/11/07 with respect to claim 1 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the combination of Ryan and Camara does not disclose a scriptable script engine module as recited in claim 1. In contrast to the Applicant's arguments, the combination of Ryan and Camara disclose a scriptable script engine module in a standalone multifunction device. The multifunction device in Camara represents the system with the operating system which comprises the script engine module. Camara discloses a scripting engine which allows the multifunction device to configure to interface with a business application including a scanning application and image acquisition application. The multifunction device of Camara discloses a scripting engine which is responsible for controlling the multifunction device and interfacing with business application functions. The script engine of Camara controls the multifunction device. The scripts executed by the script engine allows for interfacing with a business application to carry out distinct business application functions. See column 7, lines 48-60.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-20 have not been considered in view of the claims being canceled.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Responses to this action should be submitted as per the options cited below: The United States Patent and Trademark Office requires most patent related correspondence to be: a) faxed to the Central Fax number (571-273-8300) b) hand carried or delivered to the Customer Service Window (located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), c) mailed to the mailing address set forth in 37 CFR 1.1 (e.g., P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450), or d) transmitted to the Office using the Office's Electronic Filing System.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Namitha Pillai whose telephone number is (571) 272-4054. The examiner can normally be reached from 8:30 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doon Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767.

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/777,575

Page 11

Art Unit: 2100

Namitha Pillai
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2173
May 6, 2008

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2173